

THE
MONTHLY JOURNAL.

VOL. V.]

BOSTON, AUGUST, 1864.

[No. 8.

A SERMON ON SIN.

BY REV. C. C. EVERETT, BANGOR, ME.

JAMES i. 15: "Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death."

I HAVE, to-night, to speak to you of sin. This we are apt to consider the great mystery of the universe. It is the blot that darkens our theology as well as our life; the stumbling-block alike of our speculation and our philanthropy. Think only what the world would be without sin. Look at the structure of mind, and of body, and of society. Think of the family, with all its dear associations. Think of the relations of friendship, of neighborhoods, and of nations. Look at the many channels of activity that are open to us. Look at the manifold delights that are given us, at the sympathy that lightens sorrow, and at the great love that broods over all. I suppose, that, if one should plan an ideal world, one could not form a more perfect, a more beautiful image than that of this world without sin. Suffering, to some extent, would have to be, I suppose, in the picture of this ideal world; for, if the soul did not need its purifying, it would need its strengthening and its hardening. But sin is in the world. We find everywhere its

defiling presence. It drives away the quiet joy of homes. It brings hatred into society. It tramples on the weak. It makes merchandise of the best affections, of the noblest faculties. It changes every thing. If our thought of heaven could hardly be fairer than the thought of this world, as a sinless world; so our thought of hell could hardly be fouler than many a spot on this same earth has been made by sin. When we flee from man's weakness to God's omnipotence, we are met by the same dark presence. God's love and holiness are omnipotent, we say; yet sin ravages his earth, consuming his children, corrupting their souls, and often, where it cannot corrupt their spirits, crushing their lives.

In speaking of sin, I shall thus have to consider it under two aspects. First, we shall have to examine its nature and its laws; secondly, we shall have to seek its place in God's universe. Our first question, then, will be, What is sin? and the second will be, Why is it? The first involves the scientific view of sin; the second, the metaphysical or theological view of it.

In treating of the subject, it is the first of these aspects that will demand the greatest part of our time and thought; for it is in the consideration of this that we shall obtain the most definite and positive results. Some have thought it, indeed, impossible to define sin. Sin, they have said, is the exceptional, the lawless, the disorderly. Laws we may systematize; order we may define and describe: but the lawless and the disorderly, by their very nature, forbid systematizing, and exclude definition. Science, however, gives us larger and truer views. There is nothing lawless, nothing disorderly, in the universe. Every thing has a law and an order of its own. Disease has its laws, no less than health. Death itself, the great disturber, the great disorganizer, is no less orderly and regular than life. Indeed, it

is easier to define death than life. I can tell you what death is; I can unfold to you the nature and the laws of dissolution: but what life is—this is the question that sets at nought our science. Death we can analyze and comprehend. The vital power has fled before our analysis can begin. Thus my task is comparatively easy, to tell you what sin is. His would be the labor who should undertake to explain what is that infinite life that conquers sin. The subject has indeed been darkened by speculation, and obscured by dogmatic theory. Before proceeding, then, to the direct discussion of the subject, it will be necessary to refer to two different views of sin that have been commonly held, in order to remove them out of our way. The first of these makes of sin a theological abstraction. It is easy to see the effect of this. If I should tell you that you were all wicked and base, you would be surprised. Some would be angry; some would be amused. But if I should say to you, "You are all sinners," it would make very little impression. Nobody's feelings would be hurt; no one would be angry. No one would even be amused. It would be received as a truism, and yet no one would be troubled by it. Why is this? One reason is, that we have been taught that sin is a universal and unavoidable part of our human nature. We have it by no fault of ours, but by inheritance, as we have our bodily weakness. Tell a man that he is a weak creature, he cannot reach even to the moon, and he will answer, untroubled, "Of course I cannot: nobody can." Tell a man that he is a sinner, and he will answer in the same spirit, "Of course I am: everybody is." The confession of many a man would be, "Of course I am a sinner." The burden of sin is thus like the weight of the atmosphere, which presses on all, is taken for granted, and forgotten. No amount of preaching could make a man feel the fifteen-pound weight of atmosphere, that presses on

every square inch of the surface of his body, to be a burden. The great reason for this indifference to sin, however, is, that the Church has separated it from any connection with our moral nature. I once heard from a good lady this very thoughtless, but at the same time very true, expression of the notion of sin prevalent in the churches: "A man," she said, "can be totally depraved, and yet be a very good man." That is to say, a man might have all of Adam's sin, all of this ecclesiastical sin, all of this total depravity, and yet his moral nature be unharmed. This is the reason that men bear to be told that they are sinners. It does not mean any thing bad; or, rather, it does not mean any thing.

The Church has added to this nonentity of the word "sin" by inventing ecclesiastical sins; that is, it has called things sinful that have no moral wrong connected with them, that thus do not differ perceptibly from what are allowed to be innocent. These artificial and technical sins have been so much dwelt upon, that they have kept the real ones in the shade, and given them a certain respectability. In India, it is a sin to eat beef. No wonder that it is there no sin to lie. In Catholic countries, it is a sin to eat meat on Fridays. In Protestant New England, what a catalogue could be made of innocent recreations, of unavoidable beliefs, which have been classed as sinful! Thus the Church has spent much of its strength in fighting phantoms of its own conjuring, and by so much has the moral sense of the world been deadened. The truth of what I have said may be seen by observing the different effect produced by putting any definite moral meaning into the word. When the Church, for instance, began to say that slavery was a sin, what a startling effect was produced! Before, it had been firing with blank cartridges. Now it was evident that something more real was going on. Men that had slum-

bered all their lives, under the imputation of being sinners, were aroused when they found the word meant any thing. I speak of this because it is an example on a large scale. The same effect is produced, to a greater or less extent, when any habit or act, common or dear to any, with any real moral wrong connected with it, is called sinful.

As a re-action against the views of sin which I have described, which sever it, to so very great extent, from any real connection with our true life, it has been often affirmed, on the other hand, that sin is merely the doing of what we know to be wrong. This definition, by its simplicity, commends itself to many minds. I wish it were true. But it is, unfortunately, not deep and broad enough. The most terrible thing about sin is its power to blind. Sin deceives, stupefies, deadens. We say, Do right, and shun the wrong; but who shall tell, in every case, what is right, and what is wrong? The young man begins life, abhorring sin. How should he know that the respectable adviser that comes to him with precedents and credentials from society, and leads him pleasantly along smooth paths, so easy and smooth at first,—how should he know that this is sin? The passionate man does not say to himself, “Now I am angry and unreasonable.” He says, “I am not angry. I don’t care a straw about the matter. It is the principle of the thing that I look at; and that fellow is a miserable mean scamp, who ought to be punished, and I would like to have the punishing of him.” The envious and discontented man does not say, “I am a poor fool, looking only at the dark when there is so much brightness.” No: what he says is, “I am a misused person. Nothing goes right with me, while all my neighbors are prospering.” The close, mean man has an excuse, plausible enough, for every separate piece of stinginess; the neglectful man, for every particular neglect. They do not put all together, and see their lives as one

great neglect, one great, cold, empty meanness. The sensualist and the rumseller do not look at that part of their work which is black with corruption. Thus every mood justifies itself; every act glosses itself with fine names. I do not say that a man never does what he knows to be wrong: your consciences would cry out against me if I did. There are times when a man weighs the guilt of an action with its price, and accepts the price in spite of the guilt. There are times when a man, sold to some evil habit, sees its vileness, yet feels himself unable to contend against it. What I do say is, that if you will look over your lives, and separate the actions which you did with a full knowledge of their evil, you will have done a good work. But you need not flatter yourselves that you have got all the sin out of your lives. These are as the spray to the cataract. Sin blinds and deadens. It is the house-breaker, that holds the chloroform to your nostrils, and then robs you.

This examination of false and imperfect theories of sin has not been wholly fruitless of positive results. We have learned, from the deficiency that we have felt in these, first, that sin has a real connection with our lives,—that it is not independent of our responsibility; and yet, secondly, that it lies deeper than our wills. Let us now attempt to reach a more true and comprehensive view. To do this, we must glance at the natural and perfect condition of human life, just as, in the study of our physical nature, the science of pathology, which treats of the diseases of the body, has to recognize, in a general way, physiology, which treats of its natural and normal state.

If we take simply historical facts and data, we find, that, from the earliest period, man has been emerging from a state of barbarous and savage life towards one of civilization. I make here no question as to whether this savage

state was the result of a previous fall or a previous elevation. I simply take this as the earliest reliable historic starting-point. The principle of savage life is, every man for himself. The principle of a true Christian civilization is the mutual interdependence of all. The life of the savage is but little above that of the beast. The civilized Christian man stands but little lower than the angels. We may therefore assume, without affirming any thing in regard to the origin of the human race, or the degree of perfection which it will reach upon this earth, for the one pole of this grand movement, the animal life; for the other, the largest conceivable principle of love and of mutual service. We may, then, speak of the progress of the race as being in the direction from the beastly towards the heavenly. The life of the animal is based on selfishness; the life of the Christian man, on love. The savage, in the deepest barbarism, has to stand for himself and by himself. He has no standard but his own good; no law but his own caprice; no defence but his own strength or cunning; no divinity but the material forms and forces, the stocks and the stones and the elements, that are about him. The Christian man has learned to submit to law, to sacrifice his own good to that of others, to live in the recognition of a God who is the infinite love. The same is true of our individual growth. The infant has simply animal wants. Its only safety, its only possibility of life, is in its persistent demand for the supply of these. Its life is in itself. It has no recognition of others and their claims. Afterwards, if its spiritual development is complete, it learns to deny itself for the good of others. We have thus two extremes. At the one, we have the animal nature; at the other, the spiritual. The principle of the animal life is selfishness: the principle of the spiritual life is love. In the natural life of the race and the individual, we have a progress, away from one of

these extremes, toward the other. Here we can see what sin is. Sin consists in the disturbance of this harmonious relation. It is selfishness in an atmosphere of love. It is materialism in the presence of spiritual truth. It is the instinct of the beast and of the savage asserting itself in the beautiful order of a Christian civilization. The Devil is painted with hoofs and horns. Very well: the Devil is a beast; the devilish is the beastly.

For while the great principle of human life is growth and progress; while it consists in rising higher toward God, in expanding more broadly in love, — it is possible for the individual to reverse this movement; to sink instead of rising; to turn backward and downward toward the beast, instead of rising upward toward God. It is possible to become shut in by selfishness, instead of expanding in love. It is not where we are, but the way in which we are moving, the attraction of our nature, the longing of our heart, that determines our state. The topmost branch of the grandest tree, if it be struck with death, is more worthless than the humblest shoot just springing out of the earth full of fresh life. So the angel who stands nearest the throne of God, and beholds with steadfast gaze his glory, if he should turn away, and suffer his longings to sink to lower things, is more sinful than the poor sunken soul, who is yet, with a resolute heart and purpose, struggling up out of his depths of shame, lured on by the merest glimpse of the heavenly beauty that has shined upon him.

I say, this debasement is possible. It is rather inevitable, where there is no purpose of growth, no principle of goodness. Life in the spirit is an energy. It chooses the best, and strives after it. Where this energy is wanting, life is wanting. Sin is thus the sinking into the control of lower forces and impulses, when we ought, by the free exercise of our will, to rise into the sphere of the higher. It

is the drifting with these lower forces, when we ought to will to rise above them, as a vessel may drift with the winds and waves by no act of the sailor, who yet is responsible for this movement; for he should, like a man, seize the helm, and hold the vessel to her true course. Sin is the absence of the better life. It is thus the death of the soul.

When I speak of sin as death, I do not use a mere figure of speech. The same formula which would describe the death of the body, would also describe this dying of the soul. In the living body, all the chemical processes and affinities are made subject and helpful to this bodily life. In death, the elements of the body follow their chemical affinities and mechanical attractions. In death, then, the body sinks from the sphere of life into that of chemistry and mechanics. Sin is a precisely similar process. In the true life, all the instincts, desires, and passions, the impulses to activity, the love of the good opinion of others, the desire of gain, the demands of the senses, are made subject and helpful to the spiritual life. In sin, these desires, instincts, and passions seek each its own gratification and affinity. In both cases, these lower processes are not wrong. No laws, principles, or powers are bad. The laws of attraction and of chemistry are as pure as the laws of life. The animal nature has also its place. We look upon the experiments in the chemist's laboratory without disgust. We look at a beast without loathing. What makes corruption of the body or the soul disgusting and base is, that it implies a fall, a debasement, an unnaturalness. But the unnaturalness is not of the process, not of the laws: but because, in the one case, the body has fallen from the higher plane of animal life into that of chemistry; and, in the other, that the soul, created for the spiritual life, has sunk into the merely animal life. Though, as I have said,

we look upon a beast without disgust, when a man makes a beast of himself, then we feel horror or loathing. There are many forms and degrees of this debasement. There are lower and lower planes, lower and lower systems of laws, to which the soul may sink. There is that of simple conformity to the common morality of society, instead of acting from the highest principle of right. There is that of self-aggrandizement, without regard to other objects. There is that of caprice and passion. There is that of sensuality, where the appetites are supreme. Each of these planes has its place and its relation; but when this subordination is lost, when the soul is at the mercy of these lower disorganizing forces, then begins its corruption and rottenness. In Naples, in the burial-place of the poor, are grouped together three hundred and sixty-five pits, one of which is open every midnight, and the poor dead of the city, for the day that is past, are thrown into it. You can guess, I will not picture, the loathsome spectacle. We can imagine how a like loathing and horror might fill the heart of some pure angel as he gazed down into the depths of sin, where souls have fallen together in a like decay. It is a fearful picture: but it is such an one as Jesus drew when he pointed his hearers to that ill-famed valley where the corruption of the city was daily cast; that corruption in which the worm revelled, and which the fires, burning day and night, could not consume, — “where the worm dieth not, and the fire is not quenched.” And the text sums up in a word what I have been saying at greater length: “Every man is tempted when he is drawn away of his own lust and enticed. Then, when lust hath conceived, it bringeth forth sin; and sin, when it is finished, bringeth forth death.” And here we see the folly of that admiration which some have for some kinds of sin, as though they show strength. Sin is always, and only, weakness. The mistake is always

made by comparing some weak-spirited person, who is blameless and upright, with some strong, bold mind that has cast off the restraints of virtue. The comparison is wrong. Do you not know, that, if you hold lightly a weak spirit that is pure and upright, you would despise it if it became led away by temptation? Weakness given over to vice — do you not know how contemptible it is? It becomes a tool. If before it had little wisdom, it now prates maudlin folly; while the strong mind that has wandered into sin is strong, not through, but in spite of, its sin. Imagine the same strength triumphing over the passions, instead of yielding to them; pressing on towards some high aim, instead of drifting, the sport of these lower forces, — and you have a strength that is infinitely grander. It is a grand sight to see a ship driven at the mercy of wind and wave; but the grandeur is not in the ship: it is in the tempest, that is stronger than even its strength. It is a grander sight to see a vessel, large and strong, pursuing its own course through the tempest, proudly riding the beating waves, and making the winds its ministers. Here the sublimity is in the ship that conquers the storm. Such an unmanned and tempest-tossed bark as I have described is every soul that yields itself to sin. The larger, the stronger, the nobler the soul, the more terrible its wreck.

We have thus considered the nature of sin, seeking an answer to our first question. We have found it to be, according to the degree of its development or the relation in which it is viewed, first, selfishness; secondly, the assertion of themselves by the savage or beastly elements of the nature; and, thirdly, death. As the leaf, separating itself from the common life of the tree, falls into the domain of chemical forces, and is consumed; so the spirit that separates itself from the common and true life of the world, which is progressive and divine, becomes a prey to the

lower forces of its nature, which are those of death and dissolution.

The question here meets us, Why does God suffer these deadly forces to rage among his children? Why has been let loose this terrible pestilence, from the taint of which hardly a spirit has been wholly free?

Some would tell us, that sin is an absolutely hostile element that God has nothing to do with. It is an enemy, ravaging his kingdom. Others would tell us, that it is one of God's appointed instruments of good. Neither of these explanations leaves us satisfied. If it is an utterly foreign element, how do we know that it may not prove to be the stronger? Who shall foretell the issue of the doubtful fight? We feel as if the great Father had left us helpless in the presence of a deadly foe. If, on the other hand, God is made, directly or indirectly, the author of sin, we feel that our thought of his purity is tarnished. Our hatred of sin grows into something like toleration. We are like a child who should find his father, instead of punishing, encouraging his vice. It does not remove the trouble to say, as I have said, that all the forces of life are in themselves good; that it is only the fall of the spirit which is evil. Why does God permit his children to play so near this unguarded precipice? If you let a child stray from your hand, and fall down some rocky steep, will it help the mother's grief to point her to the beauty of the rock, or of the vines that trail over it? It does not help the matter to say, as I have said in effect, that sin is the mere absence of goodness; that it is thus a mere negation, in itself nothing. Cold is nothing; but will it help the poor mother, striving to keep a little warmth, which is life, in the body of her shivering child, to tell her that cold is a mere negation, a nothing? Cold, hunger, and death are nothing; yet they are none the less terrible. Practically, sin is a reality,

define it as we will. We are thus lost in a maze of speculation from which there is no outlet. The intellect and the heart are at hopeless strife. The intellect cries, "All things are of God:" the heart, strong in its moral sense, answers, "Sin cannot be of God."

The truth is, that we can see nothing absolutely as God sees it. We cannot say of any thing why God made it. We cannot say of any thing how God caused it, or what is its final cause. We know that God is; we know that all things are working out some vast plan: but what this plan is, or how God is working in all things, we cannot say, save partially. Why did God make the ocean, or the stars, or a single flower? You can tell what the ocean is to you; you can feel its sublimity; you can use it for your ends: but how God looks upon it, what is its place in his order of the universe, you cannot say. Neither you nor I can say why God called into existence that vast, to our vision endless, procession of living things, that has slowly moved, in inverted order, across the earth,—these myriad forms of weakness or Titanic strength, of beauty or deformity, of sweetness or terror,—till man came to be the head of all. Neither you nor I can say how the breath of God congealed into that filmy nebula which was the germ of the worlds. We believe that God is. Meanwhile, here is the mixed and varied world, that we must take as we find it, and do the best we can with it. And in this world is sin, with the stamp of God's curse upon it. This we must take, as all things else, as we find it. The question, then, is, not to find any good in sin: it is how to get good out of it. The solution here, as in all cases, is practical, not theoretical. What the intellect cannot do, in that it is weak, that the practical energy of man, strong by the inspiration of God's spirit, can effect. Sin in itself is an utter and unmitigated evil. When it is conquered, it becomes transformed into a good.

I remember once to have seen a striking and well-known picture by Guido: it was "The Conquest of the Dragon by the Archangel Michael." The angel stands glorious, the dragon under his feet. The foul monster has become an element of beauty; but it is the monster under the feet of the angel. You ask me how to reconcile sin with the order and beauty of the universe. I answer, Trample it under your feet, and you will see. All the grand epochs of our human history are grand because they repeat the theme of that picture of Guido, — the Devil at the feet of the angel. Jesus himself is divine because he conquered the world's sin: therefore hath God highly exalted him. Slavery in itself is an unblessed evil; it is a deadly disease, eating out the life of the Republic: but when the nation shall stand triumphant, its mortal foe conquered and dead beneath its feet, then even slavery shall have become a source of honor and strength to it.

We saw at first that suffering must be an element of the perfect world. I now ask you if — leaving behind you all the questionings, which, however pressing, we have found to be unanswerable; forgetting all the theories, each of which, however plausible by itself, must stand silent in the presence of its rivals — you can conceive of the perfect world not made glorious by the conquest of sin. The artists strive to paint us angels: but their fairest faces are tame and expressionless, compared with many a human face; for, in the angels, they would paint us faces that bear no mark of a triumph over sin.

Our second question was, as to the place of sin in the universe. I answer, Its place is under the feet of the angel. Set your own feet, by God's help, then, on the body of your own sin. Sin is death; but thus you shall rise on stepping-stones —

"Of your dead selves to higher things."

Thus, so soon as a man tramples under foot his own sin, is the mystery of evil solved for him. And so soon as every soul in the universe shall have won for itself a like triumph, then shall the mystery of evil have been solved for the universe; and death, even the death of sin, shall be swallowed up in victory.

THE ALLOTROPIC TRINITY.*

WE give below the name of a modest and earnest little tract, well written, and written with an honest purpose. Indeed, the author seems so sincere in his belief that he has found an analogy to the Trinity in Nature, that we almost think he will be able to see the fallacy of his argument when it is pointed out to him.

Let us first state the argument, and then we can indicate the error involved in it.

The argument is a simple one. The writer does not try to mystify the subject. He candidly admits that his argument cannot *prove* the doctrine of the Trinity to be true; but he claims that it proves it to be reasonable. He asserts that he has found a precise analogue in nature for the Trinity, in the chemical phenomena called *allotropism*.

Now, we cheerfully grant, that, if this be so, the argument against the Trinity, from its unreasonableness or absurdity, is no longer tenable. We wish to be as candid as our Trinitarian friend; and we are ready to admit that

* *The Mystery of the Trinity paralleled in Nature.* An Analogical Argument. By WILLIAM R. HUNTINGTON, Rector of All-Saints' Church, Worcester. Boston: E. P. Dutton & Co., Publishers. 1864.

there is nothing unreasonable in the doctrine, *if one precise analogy for it can be found in the realm of Nature.*

This the writer claims to have done ; and, in order to do justice to his argument, we will quote the principal passage of his tract, in his own words :—

“ One of the most widely diffused and best known of the elements is that called carbon ; and it is with this remarkable substance that we are now to deal. Carbon is the principal constituent of the organic world ; it is the chief ingredient of all animal and vegetable fabrics ; and is, perhaps, if we may draw comparisons in such a case, the most useful of the elements.

“ Now, this element, carbon, possesses a most singular and mysterious property of appearing in Nature under several separate and utterly diverse forms. This property, which scientific men do not undertake to explain, is called by them *Allotropism*, — a Greek word, that implies existence in different conditions. There are several substances besides carbon that are allotropic ; but, since this is the most familiar one, it shall be made to serve the purposes of our argument.

“ The allotropic forms of carbon are three in number : namely, the burnt wood we call charcoal ; the substance known as graphite, or, more familiarly, black-lead ; and the diamond. Strange as it may seem, these three substances, that to an observer would appear, and in one sense really are, utterly diverse, can be proved to demonstration to be in reality one and the same identical element, — carbon. It is not necessary to go into details with regard to the proof of this identity. The simplest text-book of chemistry will resolve any doubt on the point. Any analyst will tell you, that, mysterious and inexplicable as it may seem, his processes prove, beyond a doubt, that these three things — charcoal, graphite, and the diamond — are, each and all, one and the selfsame substance, — carbon. Thus, while carbon may be said to be in one sense one, in another sense it is just as truly three.

“ We do not know that this curious phenomenon of science has ever been brought into notice in this connection ; but certainly it meets the difficulty most fully. The reader will be

astonished, if he gives the subject thought, to find how perfectly the two mysteries, the one in the natural and the other in the spiritual world, correspond to and illustrate one another.

“If, for example, we were to take a very elaborate and precise statement of the doctrine of the Trinity, such as the so-called Athanasian Creed, and in certain portions were to substitute for the divine name the word Carbon, and for the names of the various personalities of the Deity were to substitute the names of the three allotropic forms of carbon, we should have as the result a chemical creed, or form of belief, touching this element, quite as unintelligible as the theological creed, so far as comprehending the mystery involved is concerned, but, at the same time, clearly incontrovertible and true. Thus, in enunciating the doctrine of the Trinity, we say that the Father is God, the Son is God, the Holy Ghost is God; and yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So we may say, in the supposed chemical creed, the diamond is carbon, the graphite is carbon, the charcoal is carbon; and yet there are not three carbons, but one carbon.

“Again: we are cautioned in Trinitarian statements of belief against confounding the persons of the Godhead, and are bidden to hold that the Father is not the Son, the Son is not the Spirit, the Spirit is not the Father; while yet the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Spirit is God.

“Any analogy that meets the requirements of this symbol must, of necessity, be a true one. No severer test can be suggested.* Yet the facts with regard to carbon inexorably demand just this statement, and no other. If we read from the angles of the triangle to the centre, we have the declarations that —

Diamond is carbon;

Charcoal is carbon;

Graphite is carbon;

and each of these declarations is true.

* This remark will be found to be true, if *all* the requirements of the symbol are carefully kept in mind.

“If now we read around the perimeter of the figure, we have the declarations that —

Diamond is not charcoal;

Charcoal is not graphite;

Graphite is not diamond;

and each of these declarations is true.

“Thus it is demonstrated that we do not escape from the mystery of tri-unity by appealing from Scripture to the light of Nature; for Nature offers us the very same mystery, and proves to us, in her own method, that, although we may not be able to understand how a thing is at the same time one and three, it is, nevertheless, a fact that this can be, *because it is*. The particular point that the Unitarian mind seems to find a difficulty in grasping is the relation between substance and person. But the phenomenon of allotropism illustrates this relation perfectly. The substance is carbon, in its essence not understood by us, but only known to exist: the personalities or hypostases are charcoal, diamond, and graphite. Through these hypostases the substance carbon becomes manifest to us.”

Having thus stated the argument of the writer in his own words, we proceed to examine it.

The fact of *allotropism* is, as our friend states it, not that a substance can exist *at the same time* in three forms or modes of existence, but that it can pass entire and complete out of one mode or form or condition into another form. This, then, would be a precise analogy of the Trinity, if the Trinity means that God, first existing as the Father, can pass from that mode into another mode, — that of the Son; and then into another, — that of the Spirit. For Mr. Huntington will not pretend that the same carbon can exist *simultaneously* in its three forms of charcoal, diamond, and graphite. But the doctrine of the Trinity means that the whole infinite being of God exists *simultaneously* as Father, Son, and Spirit. The analogy therefore fails in this point, and is not “the precise analogue” which the writer claims.

To vary the illustration, take the case of sulphur. This element is usually met in the form of a bright yellow, brittle solid, fusing at a heat of two hundred and forty degrees; and then, if cooled gradually, resuming its original appearance. But if sulphur be heated to five hundred degrees, and then suddenly cooled, it forms a soft amber-brown mass, which can be drawn into strings, elastic as caoutchouc. Now, here is a simple substance which can appear in two different forms. There is nothing very mysterious in such a fact as this. If the doctrine of the Trinity, therefore, merely taught that the Deity manifested himself sometimes in one way, and sometimes in another (appearing, for instance, in Nature as the Father, and then appearing in Christ as the Son), there would be nothing to object to, on the ground of reason, in this doctrine.

But we presume no chemist would maintain, that, while sulphur is in its brittle form, it is also, *at the same time*, in its elastic form. No chemist will pretend that the same carbon is *at the same time* in the form of diamond, of graphite, of charcoal. But the doctrine of the Trinity does assert, that God exists, *at once and at the same time*, as Father, Son, and Spirit. Consequently, Mr. Huntington's analogy utterly fails, and breaks down. Consequently, he has *not* accomplished his object of proving the Unitarian objection untenable.

All that Mr. Huntington's analogy can prove is, that there is nothing unreasonable in supposing that the Deity may pass from one form of existence into another; existing at one time as Father, then as Son, and then as Spirit. But we are not aware that any Unitarian ever supposed such a change of modal existence to *be* unreasonable. The objection of the Unitarian is to the statement, that the one sole Deity can exist *at once* as three persons, — Father, Son, and Spirit; supposing these three personalities to be any thing more than forms of existence. The very point

of our objection, therefore, is the point where the analogy fails; and, failing *at that point*, it fails wholly.

But we are willing, for the sake of argument, to waive this objection to Mr. Huntington's view, in order to show how radically it fails as any analogy to the church doctrine of the Trinity. We will grant (what is impossible) that all the carbon in nature may exist, and does exist, *simultaneously*, in its three forms of charcoal, graphite, and diamond. Evidently this will come much nearer being a precise analogue to the Trinity than the actual fact. But we assert, that, even under this condition, the allotropic forms of carbon utterly fail of illustrating the Orthodox Trinity, and only illustrate what has always been regarded as a heresy, and what Mr. Huntington himself regards as a heresy; namely, Sabellianism.

For what, in this case, would be the fact? Plainly this: that the one substance, carbon, appears simultaneously in the three *forms* of charcoal, graphite, and diamond. The triplicity is clearly modal, — a triplicity of form or appearance. The FATHER is then one aspect or mode of divine action, the SON another, the HOLY SPIRIT a third. Each is truly God. God is seen, *but not wholly seen*, in each. He who only sees diamond, sees indeed carbon in its reality, but does not see carbon in its total character. He does not know carbon fully till he has seen it also as graphite and charcoal. So he who sees Deity only as the Father, or only as the Son, does not know God as he ought to know him. He has seen him in one of his forms or manifestations; but he must see him in all, in order to know him wholly.

According to this analogy, therefore, each of the three persons is *really* God, but not *fully* God, without the others. This may be, and we believe is, a truer doctrine of the Trinity than the church doctrine; but it is *not* the church doctrine, nor is it Orthodoxy. It is not Orthodoxy,

because it makes each of the divine persons imperfect without the others. But that which is imperfect is not God: consequently, neither the Father, the Son, nor the Spirit, is truly God. Each has something, wanting to the others; but that something must be something divine, since it belongs to a divine person. Consequently, each of the other persons is wanting in this divine quality; is therefore imperfectly divine; is therefore *not* God.

The unreason in the Orthodox Trinity, and the impossibility of finding any adequate analogue to it in nature, lies at this point. The Orthodox formula forbids us "to divide the substance, or confound the persons." But every statement, made distinct by an analogy, must inevitably divide the substance or confound the persons. Every thing which differences the persons from each other must belong to the divine substance or the divine form. If it belongs to the first, we divide the substance, and have three Gods; if to the other, we confound the persons, and have one God in a threefold manifestation of himself.

If we regard the three persons in the Godhead as persons in any real sense, we divide the substance, and fall into Tritheism. The moment we ascribe a separate consciousness and will to the Father, Son, and Spirit, we think of them as of three Gods. The largest part of Christendom has lapsed into this error; and yet this extreme is always regarded as more Orthodox than the other. Any tendency to Sabellianism is looked on by the Church with great suspicion; while any tendency to Tritheism is allowed to go almost unquestioned.

To show still further that the "allotropic" illustration gives us one substance in three forms, and that all distinction of personality is thus lost, let us attempt to ascribe to these forms the same personality which the Church ascribes to the triplicity. Let the diamond, graphites, and charcoal be each endowed with a distinct consciousness and will.

United in one substance as carbon, let the diamond think, will, and love from its own personality, and the graphites and charcoal do the same. Is it possible now to conceive of them as one being? The mind is incapable of conceiving such a statement. We may say it, in order to be Orthodox; but we cannot *think* it. Three separate wills, each with its own separate consciousness, can only be conceived of by the reason as three separate beings.

We have not space to pursue this inquiry, interesting as it is. We think, however, that we have sufficiently shown that the allotropic forms of matter are no just or perfect analogues of the Church Trinity: first, because they illustrate the idea of a being who changes himself from the Father into the Son, and from the Son into the Spirit, — which is not the church doctrine; secondly, because they illustrate only a Trinity of modes or forms (as the very name *allotropic* indicates), which again is Sabellianism, and not the church doctrine.

We have not mentioned the pictorial illustration of the Trinity, printed on the cover of the tract, and repeated in the body of it, on which the writer seems to lay some stress. We do not think that it adds to the strength of his argument. It is merely a method of stating this formula, which Mr. Huntington conceives to contain the essence of the doctrine of the Trinity.

The Father *is* God.

The Son *is* God.

The Holy Spirit *is* God.

The Father *is not* the Son nor the Spirit.

The Son *is not* the Father nor the Spirit.

The Spirit *is not* the Father nor the Son.

Mr. Huntington thinks that any analogy which can satisfy the terms of this formula is a perfect analogue to the Trinity. We believe that we can easily show him his mistake in this respect. For example, let us substitute, in his

formula, the words "a man," in place of the word "God;" and, instead of Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, let us substitute Peter, James, and John. The formula would then read, —

Peter is not James nor John.

John is not James nor Peter.

James is not Peter nor John.

Peter is a man.

James is a man.

John is a man.

Or suppose that we should substitute for the word "God" the word "sound;" and, in the other three places, insert "speech," "music," and "thunder." The formula would then read, —

Speech is not music nor thunder.

Music is not speech nor thunder.

Thunder is not speech nor music.

Speech is sound.

Music is sound.

Thunder is sound.

Mr. Huntington will admit, that each of these two illustrations exactly fulfils the conditions of his formula. Yet he certainly will not admit that these are adequate illustrations of the Trinity; for then "God" would be only the species of which "the Father, Son, and Spirit" are the individuals.

We close our notice of this small but valuable pamphlet by repeating our expression of respect for its candor, truthfulness, and ability. In case the writer thinks that our criticism is open to objections, we shall be very happy to give him the use of our pages, to a reasonable extent, to explain himself further.

THE WESTERN CONFERENCE, 1864.

WE propose, in a brief paper, to give some idea of the Western Conference held this year in Meadville, to mention some things that grouped themselves in and about it, and try to touch the spirit of the place and time.

Meadville, just beginning to catch the public ear as a principal station on the Atlantic and Great Western Railroad, is by no means a new place. Parts of the town have quite an old look. The Court House bears the date 1825. It was a notable point when all the stores for Detroit, Chicago, and the Lake Country, passed up its little river. One very primitive log-house was pointed out to us, in which a Secretary of the Treasury had lived long ago, before he *was* Secretary of the Treasury, our guide said; and then added, "There was nothing in the treasury, either;" which, we suppose, accounts for its being a log-house still. There is even a tradition, that Washington saw either the town, or the place where it stands, when he pulled along French Creek, to get the rights of a French fort that had got itself established somewhere below, in old Colonial times. In a word, Meadville is just like any number of secluded country towns to be found in Pennsylvania and elsewhere; singular to us in this only, that, for many years, it has been a centre of liberal Christian culture, possessing a school in which young men are prepared for the ministry, so well organized and well conducted, that Eastern churches are supposed to watch regularly for its graduates, and lure them away by what are called providential invitations; which, being interpreted, mean an easier time and a larger salary than we can offer them in the West. There is also a flourishing church of our order beside this school, with a fine church building and a good organ. There is probably

no such town of three thousand inhabitants, anywhere out of New England, as a centre of our faith; and it is very interesting to trace how all this came about. In old times, churches often rose over the heart of some great king or saint or martyr. When it could beat no longer for good or evil, it was laid to rest there, and the church rose over it at once for sepulchre and shrine. The church in Meadville differs from those in this, that, instead of being builded over the pulseless heart of a dead man, it sprang out of the living heart of a living man. It is related of one of the great old Roman kings, that many years after his death, when his sepulchre was opened, all that was found of the man was dust, but that the white bark on which his laws were written was found still fresh and strong, and the characters clear as ever. It is so in Meadville. We saw a little grove, thick planted, with golden shafts of summer sunlight breaking through, where, underneath the greensward, the dust of this man is treasured; but the ideas of the man, what sprang out of his active brain and generous heart, we found written on the school, on the church, over the town, and everywhere fresh and strong. We were able also, from a fine picture, to realize something of the man himself. If we had never heard of him, we should have guessed he was a Liberal Christian of some sort, no matter where he might worship; for, as Jean Paul has said, "The wine of the soul will always taste of the cask in which it is kept." A fine, sweet face, and kindly eyes, yet strong and steady enough to stand at the head of a regiment, and not flinch for any deadly danger. In 1804, just sixty years ago, this man came to live in this valley; fifty-eight years ago, was married; and then, when God began to bless his home with little children, this question began to stir in his heart: "What is the truth I shall teach these little ones?" He was too earnest a man to take that truth at second-hand. To find it at first-hand, he read

his New Testament, carefully weighing every word. The conclusion he came to from this study was, that the doctrine of the one God, our Father, as held by Unitarians, is the truth taught in the New Testament; and, until the day he died, he was true to that conclusion. Out of this man's heart sprang this church in Meadville. It was not enough for him to know that he had got hold of a grand, central, satisfying truth: it so pulsed and tingled out of his heart, that he could not be quiet. He had to tell it; he had to establish a little paper to tell it; he had to establish a church to tell it, and a school to prepare men to tell it. Above all, and best of all, he told it in his good, open, generous life. He was a Liberal Christian all through; and so men with no particular turn for such research as had led him to the truth, when they saw the works, they knew the doctrine, that it was of God. And those children for whose welfare he strove so earnestly to find the truth are still true to the truth he found; are strong, steady, generous friends of our cause; holding fast the faith without wavering. So Meadville has become singular to us; and such is the spirit of the place where our conference met.

And, this being the spirit, it was very sweet and good, that, gathering as we did from places as wide apart as Boston, Louisville, and Milwaukie, from all sorts of geographical and intellectual distances, we should, as perhaps never before, meet with one accord. To be sure, the rock on which we split at Alton, six years ago, was no longer to be found. It was quite touching, early in the conference, when one of those gnarled and knotty men, with gleaming eyes and a rasping tongue, who have been for so many years the bane of quiet, easy-going conferences, got up, and announced himself as one of the old-guard abolitionists, an Oberlin come-outer; and then, when we were prepared to hear the ring of the old trumpet, to have him say, "Brethren, I am here to-day to take counsel with you what to do

next. I am one of many, who, while there was any anti-slavery work to do, made that their religion. It carried them out of their churches; it taught them to aspire; it has unfitted them to go back again. Now there is nothing more to do on the Western Reserve, where I live; can you help gather these earnest men and women, and preach to them the truth you hold?" The same thing was true of the conference. There was but one side. We did not bury the hatchet: we had lost it.

But there were other things on which we might have split. The opening sermon was from the text, "No man putteth new wine into old bottles;" and here at our conference, as ever, was the old wine and the new. Here were the elder ministers, still holding what was *new wine* when they were young, and in whom it has ripened evermore through the years of their honored and honorable lives, naturally preferring the old. "For no man, when he hath tasted old wine, straightway preferreth the new: he saith the old is best." But here at the conference, too, were young men, men in whom God had treasured a new vintage, ripened in a new summer. The question has been, whether this was wine at all, or some heady and evil spirit, some "rakee" that would madden and bewilder men instead of making glad the heart. As late as January, 1862, one writes, "I love Unitarianism; but I cannot bear to see it identified with mere human opinions. I cannot open my pulpit to a rationalist: I cannot exchange with one. Once let the men that hold these opinions be identified with the Unitarian body, and we shall at once forfeit the growing esteem of—other sects"! Well, the growing esteem of other sects is in danger of being forfeited. The entire body of ministers in the Western Conference met this year in Meadville with some of the most eminent from the Eastern churches; and Ephraim did not envy Judah,

nor Judah vex Ephraim. Differing as widely as men well can differ who hold the one central truth, no man at either extreme got so far away that he could not reach the hand of the man who stood farthest from him. We could account for this only on the ground that opinions are transient, and principles only are permanent. The diversities of opinion were received with a quiet catholicism. As one young man after another would rise, and give us a piece of his mind, we imagined the wise elders saying to themselves, "Well, he seems to be rash and ultra: that is not how we believed when we were young; it is not how we believe now; but 'no man putteth new wine into old bottles.'" It was as if the spirit of the place had entered into the time; as if the great true soul that had sanctified Meadville by its presence had interceded for us, crying, "Father, I pray that these may be one as we are one." If there are right and left wings in our body, they rested quietly in this conference over that in the centre, but for which they could never cleave upward into the heavens. Dr. Bartol preached the conference-sermon proper, and, with a marvellous felicity and power, opened to us the word of reconciliation. The sermon seemed to comprehend all our difference, with room to spare, as the circle comprehends the triangle. So *this* rock also was left far down as the great tide of peace and good-will rose about us; and we met with one accord.

Still, good as these things were, and full of hope, that, in the West, no minor differences can divide good men that are really in their hearts united, the best things in this conference were far more positive in their character, and more to the purpose, than either agreeing to differ, or to find that we had nothing to differ about.

The reports from the churches had one prime characteristic: they revealed the fact, that our men in the West are everywhere addressing themselves to building up, and not

to pulling down; that they accept any honest, wholesome man of any denomination, who may be preaching alongside of them, as doing the work of an evangelist: they are anxious only that such men *do* cast out devils, and then they care very little about the formulas they use. They are alive, too, to the importance of the Sunday school and other minor agencies of the Church. But the one thing which will make the conference at Meadville best worth remembering was the discussion and subsequent action on the subject of missions. There was a deep feeling of the importance of doing whatever was possible in this direction. It was clear that we had done nothing, so far, compared with what we ought to do to send out men to preach the Word; that, while the members of other denominations were cheerfully contributing to disseminate their ideas, we, who believed we were intrusted with the noblest and purest Word of life yet given to men, had done little, very little, to spread it all abroad in this new country, so rapidly rising into importance and power. The conference believed, that, if a plan could be set afoot by which this work can be well done, the churches will aid this as cheerfully as they aid every other good enterprise. Such a plan was set afoot. It was to put good men, as fast as they can be found, into all places that present good openings, especially into those towns that give a great promise of growth; such men to be supported there by the Unitarian Association and the Western societies, to be under the strict personal inspection of the Western Board. No money to be sunk in building churches: those that gather round the preacher are in all cases to build the church, the Eastern and Western societies aiding them to support the man; because, while the church is so much added to the material credit of the town, whatever else comes of it, to keep a living man at any great centre of activity,

preaching our Word of life, must be a good investment. Into whatever is done, the Eastern Association enters with perfect accord. It is considered probable that Western men can both see and oversee what is to be done and what is done most effectually; and so this part of the business is put into their hands, subject always to Eastern oversight also. So far, the East and West have put down dollar for dollar: it is hoped, that, in all enterprises set afoot, the West will, at least, do its full share. And it may well be expected that we shall be able not only to send out men, but, if we can get just what we want, tracts also; each one telling some one great truth, written directly at the Western heart, and racy of the soil; tracts written, so that, if a man begins to read them, he can no more help reading them through than he can help reading a "Ledger" story through: for, whatever they may be, the children of light *ought* to be as wise as the children of this generation. These are some of the things that were most notable in the Western Conference: they are surely hints of a genuine fellowship and cordial Christian union. They filled those that attended the conference with joy unspeakable.

THE BISHOPS LAYING THEIR HEADS TOGETHER.

THAT eminent divine of the Church of England, Rev. Sydney Smith, Canon of Bristol, Rector of Combe-Florey, and Prebend of St. Paul's, hearing some one speak of the difficulty of making a pavement out of blocks of wood, remarked, "Difficulty? I can suggest an easy plan. *Let the bishops lay their heads together, and the thing will be done!*"

What this distinguished Churchman thus said concerning bishops, it may surely be allowed to humble "dissenters"

like ourselves to repeat. The bishops of the American Church* have been laying their heads together; and the result has been the following declaration, which we have read with the awe due to such an Episcopal production, tempered with a gentle surprise at the motive of the proceeding, and the apparent result.

We have always imagined — at least, we have always been told — that the Mother-Church of England and the Daughter-Church of America — “*matre pulchrâ filia pulchrior*” — rested on the Thirty-nine Articles, as on a basis of solid rock. We have been constantly reminded of our own sad lot in not having a creed to define every thing, and to show the world at all times what is our belief. But now, it seems, the creed has given way; and the bishops have been obliged to run hastily together to construct some kind of additional prop, or underpinning, to keep the Church from toppling over. One of the Articles, it should seem, (the *sixth* perhaps, of “The Sufficiency of Holy Scripture”), has broken down. The bishops of America are obliged to tell the community, in a sort of “Round Robin,” what the English Church believes about Holy Scripture. Instead of pointing triumphantly to their articles, they have issued the following declaration: —

We the undersigned, bishops and clergymen of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the United States of America, hold it to be our bounden duty to the Church of England and Ireland, and to the souls of men, to declare our firm belief, that the said church, in common with our own and the whole Catholic Church, maintains, without reserve or qualification, the inspiration and divine authority of the whole canonical Scriptures, as not only containing, but being, the Word of God; and further teaches, in the words of our blessed Lord, that the “punishment” of

* Or some of them; for we do not see here, for example, the name of Bishop Clark, of Rhode Island.

the "cursed," equally with the "life" of the "righteous," is everlasting.

T. C. BROWNELL, Bishop of Connecticut, and Presiding Bishop.

JOHN H. HOPKINS, Bishop of Vermont.

B. B. SMITH, Bishop of the Protestant Episcopal Church in the Diocese of Kentucky.

CHARLES P. M'ILVAINE, Bishop of Ohio.

JACKSON KEMPER, Bishop of Wisconsin.

SAMUEL A. M'OSKRY, Bishop of Michigan.

W. H. DELANCEY, Bishop of Western New York.

ALFRED LEE, Bishop of Diocese of Delaware.

MANTON EASTBURN, Bishop of Massachusetts.

CARLTON CHASE, Bishop of New Hampshire.

HORATIO SOUTHGATE, Bishop.

GEORGE BURGESS, Bishop of the Diocese of Maine.

GEORGE UPFOLD, Bishop of Indiana.

J. WILLIAMS, Assistant-Bishop of Connecticut.

HENRY J. WHITEHOUSE, Bishop of Illinois.

HENRY W. LEE, Bishop of the Diocese of Iowa.

H. POTTER, Bishop of New York.

W. H. ODENHEIMER, Bishop of New Jersey.

G. T. BEDELL, Assistant-Bishop of Diocese of Ohio.

HENRY BENJAMIN WHIPPLE, Bishop of Minnesota.

JOSEPH C. TALBOT, Missionary Bishop of the North-west.

The creed therefore turns out, after all, to be of no use just when it is wanted. The object of the "Articles," so we are told, is to define the position of the Church in regard to heresies. But no sooner does a heresy arise; no sooner do the "Essays and Reviews" suggest a falling away from the faith; no sooner does Bishop Colenso begin to express doubts about the literal truth of every word of the Old Testament, — than it appears that the Articles fail of their end. As soon as the creed is wanted, it proves inadequate, and the bishops have to do what could be done just as easily if the Church had no creed; that is, they are obliged to make a new definition and statement to meet the immediate exigency. If this fact does not illustrate the utter uselessness of creeds, what *could* do it?

But, in making this declaration, the signers seem to have relied more on the weight of their episcopal authority than upon any theological acumen in the declaration itself. The question recurs, "What do they mean by it?" If they mean any thing, they seem to assert the old doctrine of the literal inspiration and infallibility of every word in our Bible, — including the doubtful books, the interpolations, the mistranslations, and the passages which plainly contradict each other. They seem disposed, in their haste, to ignore the whole result of biblical criticism for the last three hundred years. In one sweeping assertion, they assume to believe all that happens to be contained in the books called canonical, without reference to the light thrown on the text of Scripture by the labors of so many earnest and faithful scholars during all these latter days.

But do these bishops really believe "the whole canonical Scriptures" to be "the word of God"? Do they believe that God wrote Solomon's Song? Do they believe that God uttered the curses of David against the children of his enemies? Do they believe that God told him to bless any one who would dash their little ones against the stones? *Not only contains, but is, the Word of God!* Then the despairing scepticism of Ecclesiastes is the word of God! Then the worldly wisdom of the Proverbs is the word of God! Then the historical contradictions of the Books of Kings and Chronicles are announced by God as realities!

Do bishops ever read? Do bishops, by chance, ever think? Do bishops know any thing that happens in the world? Have they any idea of the state of the human mind, and the progress of human opinion? Or is the sarcasm of Sydney Smith yet true? — "Don't talk of the difficulty of a wooden pavement: let the bishops lay their heads together, and the thing will be done."

But the bishops have added, it seems, another article to

the Thirty-nine; namely, one on the belief in everlasting punishment. They should, however, not quote Scripture, unless they mean to quote it correctly. It is, perhaps, not too much to ask of a bishop to know that it is only our English translators, and *not* our Lord, who declares "the punishment of the cursed" to be "everlasting." Jesus declares that the punishment of those who cannot see *him* in the person of the stranger, the sick, the hungry, and the prisoner, is "eternal:" they go into the punishments of eternity, as distinguished from those of time. The bishops choose to make him say "everlasting." Now, the bishops know, or they do not know, that the original word is *not* "everlasting," but "eternal." They either know, or do not know, that many persons firmly believe future punishment to be *eternal* in its nature, who utterly deny that it is *everlasting*. If they do not understand this distinction, they are unfit, from ignorance, to be teachers of the Church. If they understand it, and yet wilfully ignore it, they are still more unfit to be teachers; since they then "handle the word of God deceitfully."

Let us try to show the bishops that there is such a distinction. For our own part, we firmly believe in "eternal punishment;" but we utterly deny that such punishments are therefore "everlasting." The adjective "eternal" indicates the *quality* of the punishment, and not its *duration*. Eternity is not an accumulation of periods of time; but it is the antithesis and exact contradiction to time. Eternal is the opposite of temporal.

We fully believe, therefore, in eternal punishments; that is, in punishments resulting from the sight of eternal truths and laws. Let us suppose, for instance, that there is an Episcopal bishop, who has so far forgotten the teachings of his Master as to use his influence to defend negro slavery. By books and other writings, he tries to prevent the slave's chain from being broken;

he tries to keep the laborer from receiving his due wages; he tries his utmost to maintain a system which turns man into a chattel, which makes his marriage a farce, which robs the parent of his child, the husband of his wife, at the dictate of any tyrannical master. The poor slave hungers for his freedom, and this bishop refuses him that meat; he thirsts for the water of knowledge, and the bishop denies it to him; he comes, a stranger, to the bishop's door, to beg protection, and the bishop sends for the United-States marshal to take him back to bondage. Now, we have no sort of doubt but that this bishop will go away into eternal punishment, when he sees what awful sacrilege he has committed against the temple of the Most High in the human form. One day, — *his* day of judgment, — Christ will say to him, "*I came to you hungry, in the form of that poor negro, and you gave me no meat. I came a stranger, a fugitive, and you sent me back into bondage. I was in prison and in chains, and you never came near me with any human sympathy or help. You tortured the pages of the Bible to find arguments by which to keep your Saviour in chains, and to justify the stripes laid anew on his patient form. For, inasmuch as you did it to the least of these my brethren, you have done it to me.*"

Now, if there be a bishop anywhere who has done such things as these, *this* is what he will hear in the great day of account: and then *he will go away into eternal punishment*; for the sight of this divine truth will pierce him like a two-edged sword.

But these punishments, based on the sight of eternal truth, are not, in their nature, *everlasting*. They tend to produce penitence, and to create a new life. Under their influence, let us hope that even a proslavery bishop may in time become a Christian. He may come to see the true nature of the gospel, and find it to be love to God, and

love to man, and not the being puffed up with ecclesiastical dignity ; not the laying stress on outward conformity ; not the letter of religion, which kills, but the spirit of religion, which giveth life.

THE CASE OF ATHANASE COQUEREL, FILS.

A PAMPHLET lies before us, entitled “*Église Réformée de Paris. Communication du Conseil Presbytéral aux Fidèles sur le non Renouveau de la Suffragance de M. le Pasteur Athanase Coqueril, fils. Mars, 1864. Paris.*” It gives an account of the transactions of which we have lately heard a good deal. Perhaps we may give the substance of it in a brief space.

One of the regular pastors of the Protestant Church in Paris, *M. Martin-Paschoud*, appointed in 1836, has been incapacitated during many years, by disease, for the performance of his duties. He has appointed substitutes, who have been confirmed by the Presbytery, almost since 1841. At the request of *M. Martin*, *M. Coquerel, fils*, was appointed his suffragan, first for three years, then for two. The latter term having expired, and *M. Martin* having requested its renewal, the Presbytery appointed a committee to examine the question, who reported adversely to the theological character and status of *M. Coquerel*.

Their report is contained in the pamphlet before us. Certainly, accustomed as we are to the latitude taken, not only by Liberal, but by many Orthodox preachers in our midst, it is surprising that so much should be made of such small heresies. The charges against *M. Coquerel* are these : —

1. *M. Coquerel* has said that he understands the questions of the Trinity, original sin, inspiration, and the like,

not only *somewhat differently*, but wholly differently, from the Orthodox.

2. He doubts the supernatural birth of Jesus. He says he has no precise solution to give, but foresees that his solution would not be very Orthodox.

3. He denies that Christ should be adored.

4. He does not believe in literal or verbal inspiration.

5. He calls M. Renan "dear and learned friend;" and, though differing from Renan, he treats him too kindly, and with too much praise.

6. He praises the school of Liberal theology, though not accepting all its conclusions.

7. He has published in his journal, "Le Lien," some of the publications of the "Liberal Union," — a very heretical society.

These are the charges against M. Coquerel, on account of which he was denied the renewal of his office of assistant-preacher. Compare with this very mild heresy some of H. W. Beecher's statements in a sermon published in the last number of the "Independent," in which he rebukes the narrowness and bigotry of theology, thus: —

"We are proud to say that we live in an age of enlightenment, and that we have freedom of conscience; but we persecute just as much for theological reasons as they did anterior to the Reformation, only we do it more exquisitely. We do not take away a man's liberty of thought; but we teach our children that the word *Universalist* means every thing that the word *devil* means. When a man differs from us on theology, we point him out to our children, and say, 'That is a Universalist.' Forty red dragons in the child's imagination are not more terrible than that word *Universalist*; and it shrinks from the man. Is there to be a gathering of children? His children must be excluded. They must not walk in the street with our children. And so, by an exquisite process of social torture, we punish men as severely for their opinions now as they did in former periods.

The Church now, as much as ever, chastises men, not for departure from morality, not for obliquities of disposition, but for intellectual aberrations from its creed.

“Now, I do not claim, that, because a man holds a creed, that creed is sacred from attack. I have a right to attack it intellectually, and to show that the foundations of it are insecure, and that he has reasoned wrong. I have a right to pour a flood of argument upon Unitarianism and Universalism and Catholicism, if I deem it expedient. I have a right to pursue the Baptist, the Methodist, or the Episcopalian, with reasonings, if I think it wise; and it is not persecution to argue or to reason. But when I go beyond this, and, instead of applying arguments and reasonings to a man’s belief, prejudice the community against him, so that he finds himself cut off from those around about him, finds his life less comfortable, and finds himself burdened and almost shut out from enjoyment, then I am without excuse. You do punish a man for his belief under such circumstances. And the arrogance of theology is not purged out of the Church and the world. And, as it has been for eighteen hundred years, so it is now. While the Bible says, ‘We know in part,’ theology says, ‘I know perfectly; and, if you do not know just as I do, I will punish you.’”

On Feb. 19, 1864, the Presbytery (*Conseil Presbytéral*) met to consider this question. There were present fourteen pastors and nine elders; among the latter, the celebrated writer and statesman, Guizot, now seventy-seven years old.

Speeches were made by Pastor Martin-Paschoud (in defence of his suffragan), by M. Coquerel himself, M. Mattetal, M. Guizot, and others. M. Guizot is very decided in his opposition to such liberality as that of the younger Coquerel. He says, “In a sermon on the unity of the Church, M. Coquerel calls the Socinians his Christian brethren. A church in which Socinians are admitted as brethren cannot be a Christian church.” So much for M. Guizot’s Christian charity!

Finally, at a second session, after much discussion, the vote being taken on renewing the official position of the younger Coquerel as suffragan of M. Martin, it was decided in the negative, by a vote of twelve to three.

So M. Athanase Coquerel, fils, loses his place in the pulpit, but perhaps may find another; as all admit his zeal, fidelity, and devotion as pastor, and his earnestness and ability as preacher. It is rather curious that so much should have been made out of such a small affair. The heresy is very moderate; the persecution for the heresy is of the minimum kind; and the display of mental and moral ability by the gentlemen of the majority, almost of an infinitesimal order.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Since our last Notice.

[WE shall notice, as we have opportunity, new books which have a moral, religious, or social significance, whether sent to us by the publishers or not. We shall not feel bound to notice works which do *not* possess this significance, merely because sent to us by the publisher or author. In noticing works, we shall endeavor to consult the interests of our readers rather than those of our editorial book-shelves.]

Brownson's Quarterly Review. National Series. No. III. July, 1864.

The first article of this number seems to us specially interesting and important. Its subject is, "Civil and Religious Freedom." In it Dr. Brownson takes the position, that the Society of Jesuits, and the tone of thought belonging to that society, are hostile to the best interests of the Catholic Church. "It has outlived its day and generation," he says, "and is now not inaptly symbolized by the barren fig-tree of the gospel." "They did not understand the eighteenth century, and still less do they understand this nineteenth century." Still, he says, they give tone to the Catholic Church, and a bad tone.

Mr. Brownson defends the order of things in this country as the true one; that is, equal freedom for all religions and all sects before the law. He opposes the past course of the Catholic Church in this regard, as wrong; and utterly denies the right of Church or State to use the civil power in order to force con-

sciences. "The ecclesiastical authorities of the Catholic Church," he says, "have made, and continue to make, serious blunders, which it would be worse than folly to deny." "There is not much edification in reading the Lives of the Popes, from Calixtus III. to Leo X. inclusive."

Mr. Brownson goes on to say, that many laws borrowed from Judaism and Paganism have been incorporated into the discipline of the Church, which are yet pernicious and evil. All those which justify persecution for opinion are of that kind. He does not believe in the Catholic Church of the middle ages, nor in those "ages of faith" at all.

Mr. Brownson states further, that the Jesuit party in the Catholic Church, and that party represented by the "*Civiltà Cattolica*" in Rome, by the "*Dublin Review*," by Cardinal Wiseman, and by the first three volumes of his own *Review*, does not wish for a free Church nor for a free State. In the United States, they sympathize, he says, to a man, with the Southern rebels, because they hate a republic, and wish its destruction.

After this bold defiance of the Jesuitical party in his church, Mr. Brownson declares himself in favor of modern civilization, even with all its materialistic and infidel tendencies; because it is really more Christian and Catholic than the nursery-system of the Jesuits, which seeks to keep mankind in leading-strings.

He contends further, that Christian civilization is not limited by the outward lines of the Catholic Church or of Catholic nations. "The civilization of Great Britain is, in some important relations, more Catholic than that of Austria, Italy, Spain, Portugal, or Spanish and Portuguese America." "No man who understands Christianity can exclude from Christendom the principal Protestant nations." "We may often find in them not less of Catholic truth, save in words, than we find in many Catholic nations."

Mr. Brownson says that there is less of real than of apparent heresy in the world; that the ascetic form of religion is only one side of Christianity; and the social, humane form is another, and quite as good.

Finally, he objects to the course taken in these matters by Rome and the Pope. The Pope, as spiritual father, he reveres: as secular prince, he thinks little of him. "Rome speaks only to repress: she has ceased to speak to encourage. This indicates that she feels her position insecure."

These few and brief extracts may indicate the direction of the mind of this courageous writer and strong thinker. There is no more interesting or valuable periodical than this of Dr. Brownson.

The Veil partly lifted, and Jesus becoming Visible. By W. H. FURNESS. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1864.

To be noticed hereafter.

Freedom of Mind in Willing; or, Every Being that Wills, a Creative First Cause. By ROWLAND G. HAZARD. New York: D. Appleton & Co. 1864.

We have not yet found time to read this work, but hear it spoken of by good judges as being a very able work. The title is suggestive and interesting.

First Gospel; being the Gospel according to Mark. Translated and arranged, with a Critical Examination of the Book, its Life of Jesus, and his Religion. By LEICESTER AMBROSE SAWYER, translator of the Scriptures. Boston: Walker, Wise, & Co. 1864.

Brother Sawyer certainly is a very industrious man; for he writes and publishes books faster than we poor lazy mortals can read them. He is also certainly a bold man to undertake to put so much into less than two hundred pages 12mo.

Mr. Sawyer settles, in his usual decided way, disputed questions by a very brief argument. Henceforth, it seems, we are to regard Mark's Gospel as the first (in order of time), chiefly because Matthew's Gospel contains additions which would naturally have been added to the subsequent Gospel. But suppose that Matthew's and Mark's were composed independently of each other, and that neither writer knew of the other's Gospel. This might easily have happened in that age, when there were no newspapers, "Christian Examiners," nor "Monthly Journals." Papias, who tells us all we know about it, says that Mark's Gospel contains the substance of Peter's discourses; which were chiefly accounts of the facts in the life of Jesus, of which he was a witness. Peter's tendency was rather to the pragmatic than the dogmatic: hence he might easily have omitted the Sermon on the Mount, which Matthew records. In short, we consider that the question, whether Matthew or Mark wrote first, to remain uncertain, just as it was before Mr. Sawyer wrote this book. It is not worth while quite yet to change the order of Gospels in the New Testament.

MEETINGS OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE.

July 18, 1864. — Present, Messrs. Stebbins, Livermore, Brigham, Barrett, Hackley, Ware, Lowe, Smith, Shattuck, Sawyer, and Fox.

The Committee on New-England Correspondence presented an application for aid from the society in Brunswick, Me.; and, in accordance with their recommendation, an appropriation was made of \$100.

The Army-Mission Committee reported that Mr. William M. Mellen had returned from his third visit to the Rendezvous of Distribution; having circulated fourteen thousand tracts of the "Army Series," and four thousand copies of the "Soldier's Companion."

They also reported that Mr. Calvin Stebbins had been engaged to visit the soldiers' hospitals in Washington and vicinity, for the purpose of introducing the army publications of the Association.

Rev. Charles Lowe made a report concerning the Maine Unitarian Conference, which he attended as a delegate from the Association; having been appointed by the Board at the last meeting.

The Committee on Western Correspondence reported in favor of granting to the society in Trenton, N.Y., in response to their application, the sum of \$75; which report was adopted.

The Special Committee to whom was referred, at the last meeting, the subject of the Janesville Society, reported, through Dr. Stebbins, the Chairman; who, at the same time, made his report as delegate from the Board to the Western Conference.

The Conference had agreed heartily to the plan proposed, and had appointed a Committee to act in connection with the Western Committee of the Association. They had also voted to raise for missionary work at the West, the present year, \$1,900; with the hope that the Association would appropriate, if needed, an equal amount for the same object. The Committee of the Conference, and the members of the Western Committee of the Association,

who were present at Meadville, had held a meeting, and decided concerning Janesville, that, if Mr. Farrington would take charge of the society, \$900 should be paid to him the first year, in addition to the \$600 to be raised by the Society, — \$600 towards his salary, and \$300 to enable him to meet the expense of moving. Of this amount, the Conference had agreed to pay one-half.

After accepting the report, the Board voted to appropriate for Janesville the sum fixed upon by the Committees, — \$450.

The Committee on Western Correspondence reported in favor of an appropriation of \$115 in aid of the new Unitarian Society in Winona, Minn.; this case also having been considered at Meadville, and the same amount appropriated by the Conference: and their report was adopted.

This Committee further stated, that a very satisfactory report had been received from Rev. Jasper L. Douthit, concerning his missionary labors for the Association in Southern Illinois.

Mr. Lowe stated to the Board, that the Western Conference were very desirous to have Dr. Stebbins go on a missionary tour this fall through the West, and had made a proposition to that effect, but were not able to offer a sufficient compensation to permit him to undertake the work. Mr. Lowe suggested that it would be well for the Association to make an appropriation for this object, in addition to that of the Conference, and thus enable Dr. Stebbins to make the proposed tour.

After some conversation, from which it appeared that the Board were decidedly in favor of the plan, the subject was referred to a Special Committee, consisting of Messrs. Lowe, Barrett, and Smith.

The Secretary then read the following communication from the Treasurer:—

Boston, July 18, 1864.

Mr. GEORGE W. FOX, Secretary.

MY DEAR SIR, — It is known by most of the Executive Committee that my acceptance of the Treasuryship was for the remainder of the year, or until Mr. Smith should return.

Mr. Smith has now returned; and I beg leave to offer my resignation as Treasurer of the Association.

Thanking the Committee for their confidence, I remain, with much respect,

Yours most truly,

WARREN SAWYER.

The resignation of Mr. Sawyer was accepted; and Mr. Charles C. Smith was duly elected Treasurer of the Association for the remainder of the year.

Mr. Sawyer was then chosen a member of the Executive Committee, to fill the vacancy caused by the election of Mr. Smith to the Treasuryship.

On motion of the Secretary, the Committee on Publications were authorized to give to soldiers' libraries any of the books and tracts owned by the Association, suited to that purpose; and, after the transaction of other business, the Board adjourned to Monday, Aug. 15.

INTELLIGENCE.

THE MAINE UNITARIAN CONFERENCE met at Waterville on Tuesday, June 21; the services commencing on the evening of that day with a sermon by Rev. Charles H. Wheeler, who for some months has had charge of the society in Augusta. After the discourse, the Conference was organized by the choice of Judge Ed. E. Bourne, of Kennebunk, for President; and Rev. Joshua A. Swan, of Kennebunk, for Secretary. The exercises of Wednesday forenoon commenced with a prayer and conference meeting; after which, several questions were discussed. In the afternoon, a sermon was preached by Rev. Joshua A. Swan, and the discussion of the morning was continued. It was voted at this meeting, that the present Confer-

ence be regarded as a permanent association, under the name of the Maine Unitarian Conference ; that the President and Secretary hold their offices during the present year, the latter acting also as Treasurer ; and that a committee be appointed to make arrangements for the next Annual Meeting. Rev. Cazneau Palfrey, D.D., of Belfast, Rev. Amos D. Wheeler, D.D., of Brunswick, and Rev. Charles C. Everett, of Bangor, were then chosen as this Committee. On Wednesday evening, a sermon was delivered by Rev. Dr. Palfrey ; after which the communion service was administered by Rev. John T. G. Nichols, of Saco. Thursday morning, after an hour spent in conference and prayer, the Convention adjourned.

THE TWELFTH ANNUAL CONFERENCE of the WESTERN UNITARIAN CHURCHES was held at Meadville, Penn., in connection with the ANNIVERSARY EXERCISES of the MEADVILLE THEOLOGICAL SCHOOL, commencing on Wednesday evening, June 29, with a sermon, before the graduating class and the alumni of the school, by Rev. Rufus P. Stebbins, D.D., of Cambridge, Mass.

On Thursday morning, a meeting was held for conference and prayer ; which was followed by the anniversary exercises of the Theological School. The following essays were read by the graduating class : " The Humanitarian Tendencies of the Age," by Mr. Charles A. Allen, of Cambridge, Mass. ; " The Dignity of the Christian Ministry," by Mr. William B. Buxton, of Montpelier, Vt. ; " The Ethics of Reconstruction," by Mr. Charles H. Ellis, of Boston, Mass. ; " Christianity a Religion without a Parallel," by Mr. Aaron Porter, of Salem, Mass. The essays were followed by an address by the President, Rev. Abiel A. Livermore. Thursday afternoon was occupied in hearing reports from the churches composing the Conference. Rev. Robert Collyer spoke for the Second Society of Chicago, Ill. ; Rev. Everett Finley, for the society in Bloomington, Ill. ; Rev. A. D. Mayo, for the Church of the Redeemer, and Rev. Sidney H. Morse, for the First Church, in Cincinnati, O. ; Rev. S. B. Flagg, for Kalamazoo, Mich. ; Rev. H. P. Cutting, for Winona, Minn. ; Rev. John B. Beach, for Austinburg, O. ; Rev. J. G. Forman, for Alton, Ill. ; Rev. Martin W. Willis, for Quincy, Ill. ; Rev. Carlton A. Staples, for Milwaukee, Wis. ;

Rev. A. G. Hibbard, for Detroit, Mich.; Rev. William G. Nowell, for Rockford, Ill.; Rev. Frederic M. Holland, for Marietta, O.; Rev. Robert Hassall, for Keokuk, Io.; and Rev. Walter Wilson, for Pittsburg, Penn. On the evening of Thursday, a sermon was preached by Rev. Cyrus A. Bartol, D.D., of Boston.

The exercises of Friday commenced with a meeting for conference and prayer; after which the Convention was called to order, and Rev. John H. Heywood made a report concerning his society in Louisville, Ky. Rev. Robert Collyer, of Chicago, Ill., then delivered an address on the subject of Western Missions; which was followed by remarks from several gentlemen, among whom was Rev. Dr. Stebbins, who was present as a delegate from the American Unitarian Association. He made a statement of what had been done by the Association at the West, and what they desired to do; and said that they wished to act in connection with a Committee from the Western Conference, and thus carry forward the great missionary work. A Committee was then appointed to arrange a practical organization for missionary purposes. In the afternoon, the discussion of the subject of missions was continued; and the Committee on Organization presented the following plan, which was adopted: 1. A Committee of three to be appointed, who should have the arrangement of the missions, and act in connection with the American Unitarian Association. 2. This Committee to communicate with any parties who might wish the services of a minister. 3. The churches connected with the Conference to raise \$1,500 the present year for missions. Rev. Robert Collyer, of Chicago, Ill., Rev. A. D. Mayo, of Cincinnati, O., and O. J. Steele, Esq., of Buffalo, N.Y., were then chosen as this committee.

Saturday morning, after an hour spent in conference and prayer, an address on Ministerial Study was delivered by Prof. George L. Cary, of the Theological School; which was followed by a discussion. The following officers were then elected for the ensuing year: President, Rev. George W. Hosmer, D.D., of Buffalo, N.Y. Vice-President, Rev. Abiel A. Livermore, of Meadville, Penn. Recording Secretary, Rev. S. B. Flaggs, of Kalamazoo, Mich. Corresponding Secretary, Rev. William G.

Nowell, of Rockford, Ill. Treasurer, J. Wiley, Esq., of Detroit, Mich. Executive Committee, Rev. A. G. Hibbard, of Detroit, Mich.; Rev. Robert Hassall, of Keokuk, Io.; Melancthon Starr, Esq., of Rockford, Ill.; Nathan Mead, Esq., of Chicago, Ill.; and Robert S. Brunison, Esq., of Quincy, Ill. After further discussion, it was voted to hold the Conference next year at Rockford, Ill. On Saturday evening, a sermon on Christian Patriotism was preached by Rev. John H. Heywood, of Louisville, Ky.

Sunday forenoon, Rev. A. G. Hibbard preached at the Unitarian Church, Rev. Dr. Stebbins at the Baptist, and Rev. Alfred P. Putnam at the Methodist; the two latter churches having been opened to the Conference through the courtesy of their trustees. In the afternoon, the communion service was celebrated, and, in connection with it, the commemorative service; they being conducted by Rev. Dr. Stebbins, assisted by Rev. Dr. Hosmer, Rev. Robert Collyer, and Rev. C. A. Staples. In the evening, Rev. S. B. Flagg preached in the Baptist Church, and Rev. J. G. Forman in the Methodist; and at the Unitarian Church, Mr. Everett Finley, of Bloomington, Ill., and Mr. Charles H. Ellis, one of the graduates of Thursday, were ordained to the work of the Christian ministry. With these services, the Conference closed.

THE ANNUAL VISITATION of the CAMBRIDGE DIVINITY SCHOOL occurred on Tuesday, July 19. The essays read by the graduating class were as follows: "The Divine Education of the Human Family," by Mr. John W. Chadwick, of Marblehead; "Influence of American Institutions on the Church," by Mr. George Dexter, of Worcester; "The Union of Christian Believers," by Mr. Samuel S. Green, of Worcester; "St. Paul's Service to Christian Truth and Freedom," by Mr. Nathaniel Seaver, Jr., of East Boston.

Rev. ALPHEUS S. NICKERSON was installed as pastor of the society in Sterling, Mass., on Wednesday, July 27. The order of services was as follows: Anthem; prayer, by Rev. John B. Green, of Leominster; reading of the Scripture, by Rev. Edwin J. Gerry, of Boston; hymn; sermon, by Rev. George Putnam, D.D., of Roxbury; anthem; prayer of installation, by Rev. Joseph Allen, of Northborough; right hand of fellowship,

by Rev. George M. Bartol, of Lancaster; hymn; closing prayer.

Rev. HORATIO STEBBINS has received and accepted a call from the society in San Francisco, Cal.; and will sail from New York, Aug. 13.

Mr. ISRAEL F. WILLIAMS has accepted an invitation to take charge of the society at Yonkers, N.Y., for one year.

Rev. JOHN A. BUCKINGHAM has accepted a call from the new Unitarian society in Sturbridge, Mass.

Rev. SILAS FARRINGTON, of East Bridgewater, Mass., has accepted a call from the new Unitarian society in Janesville, Wis.

Rev. THOMAS W. BROWN, of Brewster, has received a call from the society in Sandwich, Mass.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.

1864.			
July 5.	From Miss Elizabeth Richardson, to make herself a life-member	\$30.00	
" 9.	" Society in Waltham, as a donation	50.40	
" "	" Rev. F. A. Farley, D.D., trustee, as income of Graham Fund	35.00	
" 11.	" Rev. Edward J. Young's Society, Newton, as a donation	106.00	
" "	" Rev. G. W. Stacy, Rev. T. T. Stone, and Rev. S. S. Hunting, as annual memberships . . .	3.00	
" 12.	" a friend in Keene, N.H., as a donation	5.00	
" 13.	" E. H. Howard, to make himself a life-member .	30.00	
" 14.	" Miss B., for Army Fund	10.00	
" 15.	" two little children, Allie and Neddie, for Army Fund	1.00	
" 16.	" Rev. G. W. Briggs, D.D., as an annual membership	1.00	
" 18.	" a friend, for Army Fund	2.00	
" 19.	" Rev. C. A. Staples, as an annual membership .	1.00	
" 21.	" Society in New Bedford, as a donation . . .	200.00	
" "	" Society in Austintown, O., as a donation . .	7.50	
" 22.	" W. H. Brooks, as an annual membership . .	1.00	
" 23.	" a friend, for Army Fund	3.00	
" 25.	" a member of the Arlington-street Society, Boston, as a donation	50.00	
" 27.	" Society in Kennebunk, Me., as a donation . .	57.15	
" 29.	" Miss P. A. Lovejoy, for Army Fund	1.00	